

REMARKS

The undersigned wishes to thank Primary Examiner Hamilton for the courtesy and helpful comments extended during the interview of the application.

Applicants also appreciate the notification that claim 3 of the application is allowable.

The specification and claims 1, 47, 52, 55 and 61-62 have been amended, and claims 64-69 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the amendments of claims 1 and 52 appears e.g. at page 6, lines 11-15 and page 11, lines 19-25 of the application. The amendments of claims 47, 55 and 61-62 merely address non-substantive formalities-type matters. Support for new claims 64-68 appears e.g. at page 5, lines 13-18 and page 6, lines 14-18. New claim 69 corresponds to allowed claim 3 written independent form. The amendment of the specification was discussed at the interview.

Applicants respond to the Final Office Action dated September 25, 2003 as follows.

As discussed at the interview, the amendment made herein of the priority claim set forth on page 1 of the application is believed to any issues set forth at page 2 of the Office Action.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the following informality objection is set forth:

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The limitations of original claims 11 and 13 are not found in the original specification but only in claims 11 and 13.

As discussed at the interview, support for original claims 11 and 13 appears e.g. at page 6, second paragraph of the application, which states:

The oxygen and/or sulfur atoms of the heteroalicyclic ring are preferably distinct ring members (bi-radical linkages), rather than e.g. a multiple bond group such as a keto or thioketo ring member. Also, less preferred are groups that contain any such saturated groups such as a ketone or other carbonyl including ester, lactone, anhydride, etc.

In view thereof, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 61-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

It is believed the amendments made herein obviate this formalities-type rejection.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 35, 41, 46-47 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Jung et al. (GB 2320718). The rejection is traversed.

Jung GB 2320718 is cited for a certain carbonate polymer unit.

Applicants' independent claim 1 (the only independent claim rejected over Jung GB 2320718) calls for a heteroalicyclic group that does not contain a carbonyl ring member.

Such a heteroalicyclic group as Applicants claim is not disclosed or otherwise suggested by Jung GB 2320718. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 23-24, 35, 41, 46, 48-54 and 56-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Jung et al. (U.S. Patent 6,150,069). The rejection is traversed.

Jung U.S. Patent 6,150,069 is cited for a certain oxynorbornyl group.

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 52 (the only independent claims rejected over Jung U.S. Patent 6,150,069) each calls for a heteroalicyclic group that is not an oxynorbornyl.

Barclay et al.
U.S.S.N. 10/039,340
Page 10

Such a heteroalicyclic group as Applicants claim is not disclosed or otherwise suggested by Jung U.S. Patent 6,150,069.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: June 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 439-4444